

Remarks

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-10 as originally presented are allowable.

Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 11-14 that stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Brunel et al. (U.S. 5,921,644) in view of the above amendments to claim 11. Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 15-17 that stand rejected as being anticipated by Sands et al. (U.S. 6,064,569) and claim 18 that stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sands et al.

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the concept that is the focus for the Examiner's statement for reasons of allowance of claims 1-10. Claim 11 is directed to a disk drive module that is adapted to be received in a multiple disk drive storage apparatus, but is not directed to the same combination specified in claim 1. Claim 11 has also been amended to specify that the carrier body has an integrally formed ejection spring that exerts a biasing force relative to the multiple disk drive storage apparatus for disconnecting the disk drive from the multiple disk drive storage apparatus. In addition, claim 11 specifies that the carrier and disk drive have first and second cooperating surface features that create a snap-fit to retain the disk drive in the cavity. It is respectfully submitted that claim 11 and claim 12, 13 and 14 that depend from claim 11 are now in condition for allowance based upon the amendments to claim 11.

Referring to claim 15, the Sands patent is directed to a hard drive assembly for a computer that includes a light pipe that is mounted on the carrier. The light pipe is not integrally molded with the carrier, but is instead assembled with the light pipe 60 that is formed by a single strip of plastic that is snapped into position adjacent the inner surface of the sidewall 36 of the carrier. There is no disclosure in the Sands patent of **a light pipe integrally formed as part of the carrier body that extends from the rear portion of the carrier body to the front portion of the carrier body**, as specifically recited in claim 15. The Examiner

relies upon Figure 4 of the Sands patent, but ignores the clear disclosure in Figure 3 that indicates that the light pipe disclosed in Sands is an assembled part and is not integrally formed as part of the carrier body. The light pipe is a molded integral feature of the carrier that is formed from the same material as the carrier. Applicant's proposed invention minimizes the number of parts and reduces assembly time, providing an economic advantage not realized by the Sands reference.

As specified in claim 18, the entire carrier, including the light pipe, is molded of a transparent, optically conductive, polycarbonate material. The Sands patent does not disclose or suggest a light pipe that is integrally formed as part of the carrier. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claim 18 as being obvious without a teaching or suggestion in the prior art of a polycarbonate polymer that integrally forms both the carrier and light pipe as claimed.

Applicant has amended claim 11 to place claims 11-14 in condition for allowance. Applicant's remarks concerning claims 15-17 are intended to more particularly point out the feature of Applicant's invention that is not anticipated by the Sands patents. Further, Applicant's arguments in regard to claim 18 point out the elements of claim 18 that are not rendered obvious by the Sands patent. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 11-18 and that the Examiner pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL V. KONSHAK

By



Kevin J. Heim
Reg. No. 29,805
Attorney for Applicant

Date: December 2, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351